



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/462,931	01/18/2000	JUKKA HELLMAN	2328-115	5666

7590 12/13/2001

ROTHWELL FIGG ERNST & KURZ  
555 13TH STREET NW  
SUITE 701 E  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

COOK, LISA V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1641	12

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/462,931	HELLMAN ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Lisa V. Cook	1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3,5,8,12,13 and 18-26 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3,12,13 and 18-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 5,8,25 and 26 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 5,8,25 and 26 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 1-3,5,8,12,13 and 18-26 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicants' response to the Office Action mailed July 3, 2001 (Paper #11-filed 10/03/01) is acknowledged. In response to Amendment-D filed in Paper#11, claims 5 and 8 have been amended. New claims 25 and 26 were added. Claims 4, 6, and 9-11 have been cancelled at applicant's request. Currently claims 1-3, 12-13, and 18-24 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No.9. Claims 5, 8, 25, and 26 are pending and currently under consideration. Claims 4-6 and 8-11 were rejected under 35 USC 101 and 35 U.S.C.112, first and second paragraph.

### **OBJECTIONS WITHDRAWN**

#### ***Priority***

2. The application was amended to recite priority to 371 documents PCT/FI98/00550 filed 6/24/98 and foreign application No. 973371 filed 8/15/97 in Finland therein qualifying for benefits of an earlier application. (37 CFR 1.78). The objection is obviated.

### **REJECTIONS WITHDRAWN**

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefore, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claim 25 (previously claim 4) is withdrawn from rejection as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant contends that the monoclonal antibodies are man made (invention of man), particularly with respect to the claims reciting "recombinant" which suggests "hand of man". This argument was found persuasive. Therein obviating the rejection.

#### REJECTIONS MAINTAINED

##### ***Drawings***

4. The drawings in this application remain objected to by the Draftsperson under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152 (see PTO-948). Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defect can be deferred until the examiner allows the application. Applicant has deferred corrective action until allowance.

##### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

5. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the examiner on form PTO-892 or applicant on form PTO-1449 have cited the references they have not been considered.

#### NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION NECESSITATED BY AMENDMENT

##### ***Claim Objections***

6. Claims 5, 8, 25, and 26 are objected to because of the following informalities: The dependent claims do not reference a previous claim. See MPEP 608.01(n). Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 5, 8, 25, and 26 (previously 4-6 and 8-11) remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. Claims 25 and 26 are vague and indefinite because it is not clear what the monoclonal antibody will bind. As recited the monoclonal antibody is directed to any composition comprising the entire seq. Id. no.2 (lines 1-8 in the claims), monoclonal antibodies which bind fragments from amino acid position 7 to position 30 of seq. Id. no.2, and monoclonal antibodies which bind fragments from amino acid position 6 to position 30 of seq. Id. no.2. It is not clear if applicant intends the monoclonals of the instant invention to binding the full sequence of seg. Id. no.2 or fragments thereof?

The disclosure has support for Seq. Id. No.2, but does not clearly identify what is considered fragments that *span* position 6 to 30 with gamma-carboxylated glutamic acid positions 17, 21, and 24. In order to clearly identify the instantly claimed fragments, it is suggested that monoclonals of this type include Atcc deposit/accession numbers or seq. Id. nos. for proper identification. Please identify applicants intended meaning/define.

B. Claim 25 is indefinite in utilizing the phrase "having the capability of binding" because it is not clear if the monoclonal will bind human-carboxylated osteocalcin fragments or not. Please remove the ambiguous phrase.

C. Claims 26 and 8 (previously claims 6-11) remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are explained below:

The claims particularly, independent claim 26 is drawn to an assay method that employs antibodies. The antibodies bind with sequence identification no. 2, but the method does not indicate that a complex will be formed or identified (i.e. label). The method does not outline how bound complex will be separated from unbound complexes or how the complex will be correlated to seq. Id. no. 2 via detection. The recitation of a method as recited in claim 6 requires at least a contact step, a separation step, a detection step, and a correlation step. The claims do not include a separation step, a detection step (label), or a correlation step. Please include the appropriate steps.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

8. Claims 5, 8, 25, and 26 (previously 4-6 and 8-11) remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The written description in this case only sets forth monoclonal antibodies 2H9, 6F9, 3G8, 1C4, and 3H8 and therefore the written description is not commensurate in scope with the claims drawn to any monoclonal antibody that binds Seq. Id. No.2 (recited in independent claims 4 and 6). See pages 16-22. *Vas-Cath Inc. V. Mahurkar*, 19 USPQ2d 1111, clearly states that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*." (See page 1117). The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 USC 112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 115).

With the exception of Mab's 2H9, 6F9, 3G8, 1C4, and 3H8, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed structure of the encompassed monoclonal antibodies and therefore conception is not achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and a reference to a potential method of isolating it. The monoclonal antibody itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ 2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Lts.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

Furthermore, In *The Reagents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly* (43 USPQ2d 1398-1412), the court held that a generic statement which defines a genus of a compound/seq.id/etc. by only their functional activity does not provide an adequate written description of the genus.

The court indicated that while Applicants are not required to disclose every species encompassed by a genus, the description of a genus is achieved by the recitation of a representative number of molecules, usually defined by a sequence, falling within the scope of the claimed genus.

At section B(1), the court states that "An adequate written description ...'requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties', not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention" There is insufficient description in the disclosure to support the generic claims as provided by the Interim Written Description Guidelines published in the June 15, 1998 Federal Register at Volume 63, Number 114, pages 32639-32645.

Therefore only the isolated Mab's 2H9, 6F9, 3G8, 1C4, and 3H8, but not any monoclonal that competes with the monoclonal antibodies would meet the full breadth of the claims as required by the written description provision of 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

9. Claims 5, 8, 25, and 26 (previously 4-6 and 8-11) remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification lacks complete deposit information for the deposit of monoclonal antibodies 2H9, 6F9, 3G8, 1C4, and 3H8.

Because it is not clear that the properties of monoclonal antibodies 2H9, 6F9, 3G8, 1C4, and 3H8 are known and publicly available or can be reproducibly isolated from nature without undue experimentation and because the best mode disclosed by the specification requires the use of the monoclonal antibodies 2H9, 6F9, 3G8, 1C4, and 3H8, a suitable deposit for patent purposes is required. Accordingly, filing of evidence of the reproducible production monoclonal antibodies, one of ordinary skill in the art could be assured to the ability to practice the invention as claimed. Exact replication of the monoclonal antibodies is an unpredictable event.

If the deposit has been made under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty, filing of an affidavit or declaration by applicant or assignees or a statement by an attorney of record who has authority and control over the conditions of the deposit over his or her signature and registration number stating that the deposit has been accepted by an International Depository Authority under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty, that all restrictions upon public access to the deposit will be replaced if viable samples cannot be dispensed by the depository is required.

This requirement is necessary when deposits are made under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty as the Treaty leaves this specific matter to the discretion of each State. Amendment of the specification to recite the date of the deposit and the complete name and full street address of the depository is required. If the deposits have not been made under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty, then in order to certify that the deposits comply with the criteria set forth in 37 CFR §1.801-1.809, assurances regarding availability and permanency of deposits are required.

Such assurance may be in the form of an affidavit or declaration by applicants or assignees or in the form of a statement by an attorney of record that has the authority and control over the conditions of deposit over his or her signature and registration number averring:

- (a) during the pendency of this application, access to the deposits will be afforded to the Commissioner upon request;
- (b) all restrictions upon the availability to the public of the deposited biological material will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent on this application;
- © the deposits will be maintained in a public depository for a period of at least thirty years from the date of the deposit or for the enforceable life of the patent or for a period of five years after the date of the most recent request for the furnishing of a sample of the deposited biological material, whichever is longest; and
- (d) the deposits will be replaced if they should become non-viable or non-replicable.

In addition, a deposit of the biological material that is capable of self-replication either directly or indirectly must be viable at the time of the deposit and during the term of deposit. Viability may be tested by the depository.

The test must conclude only that the deposited material is capable of reproduction. A viability statement for each deposit of a biological material not made under the Budapest Treaty must be filed in the application and must contain:

- 1)The name and address of the depository;
- 2)The name and address of the depositor;
- 3)The date of deposit;
- 4)The identity of the deposit and the accession number given by the depository;
- 5)The date of the viability test;
- 6)The procedures used to obtain a sample if the test is not done by the depository; and
- 7)A statement that the deposit is capable of reproduction.

As a possible means for completing the record, applicant may submit a copy of the contract with the depository for deposit and maintenance of each deposit.

If the deposit was made after the effective filing date of the application for patent in the United States, a verified statement is required from a person in a position to corroborate that the cell line described in the specification as filed is the same as that deposited in the depository. Corroboration may take the form of a showing of a chain of custody from applicant to the depository coupled with corroboration that the deposit is identical to the biological material described in the specification and in the applicant's possession at the time the application was filed.

Applicant's attention is directed to In re Lundak, 773 F.2d. 1216, 227 USPQ 90 (CAFC 1985) and 37 CFR §1.801-1.809 for further information concerning deposit practice.

***Response to Argument***

Applicant contends that the issue of adequate written description is dependent on the facts of each individual case and the mere citation of case law for certain broad propositions cannot be taken out of the context of the specific cases. Further the presently claimed invention is directed to a monoclonal antibody or recombinant fragment, which binds a specific epitope. This argument was carefully and fully considered but not found persuasive because the rejection was based on the facts of this individual case supported by the cited case law. The instant application being directed to a monoclonal antibody and its utility lacks written description and lack enablement because the particular inventive monoclonal antibody has not been deposited.

Therein one of ordinary skill in the art could not be assured to the ability to practice the invention as claimed. Exact replication of the monoclonal antibodies of the instant invention is an unpredictable event. The rejections are maintained.

10. For reasons aforementioned, no claims are allowed.

*Remarks*

11. Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure:

A. Hellman et al. (Journal of Bone Mineral Research, Vol.11., No.8., 1996, pages 1165-1175) disclose nine monoclonal antibodies against osteocalcin via two-site assay procedures.

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform to the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 1641 Fax number is (703) 308-4242, which is able to receive transmissions 24 hours/day, 7 days/week.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lisa V. Cook whose telephone number is (703) 305-0808. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le, can be reached on (703) 305-3399.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.



CHRISTOPHER L. CHIN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1600-1641



Lisa V. Cook

CM1-7B17

(703) 305-0808

12/11/01